

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
AUGUSTA DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

v.

REALITY LEIGH WINNER

*
*
*
*
*
*
*
*

NO. 1:17-CR-00034

* * * * *

**DEFENDANT'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION TO REOPEN DETENTION
HEARING PURSUANT TO 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f) AND REQUEST FOR A HEARING**

This brief is submitted in support of Defendant's Motion to Reopen the Detention Hearing Pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). For the reasons that follow, the Court should (1) reopen the detention hearing; (2) find there is a combination of conditions that will reasonably assure Winner's appearance as required and the safety of any other person and the community; and (3) release Winner pending trial with conditions. In addition, the Defendant requests a hearing at the earliest practicable time to address the motion.

I. INTRODUCTION

At the hearing held June 8, 2017, this Court noted:

If we were dealing with the person that Miss Winner's parents know and love, then there would be no question that she ought to be released.

T-106:23-25.

We now have facts where before we had but suspicion and innuendo. All that Miss Winner owned, her cell phones and computers, including the electronic rejects from the past now found in most homes, her old cell phones and computers, have now been scrutinized by the F.B.I. We now know that the Tor computer program on Miss Winner's computer described with

such sinister terms in the Government's June proffer is used by millions of Americans for totally legitimate purposes. The Government has confessed error as to its claim that the Defendant had acknowledged release of multiple "documents" in a telephone call to her mother. Her guns described in the proffer were lawfully owned, having been provided by her caring step-father who also had trained her how to safely use these guns if needed for her defense.

Her alleged statement to the F.B.I may well be suppressed, but, even if not, it clearly falls far short of being a confession. A candid review of the facts alleged by the Government in the light of controlling precedent raises strong doubt as to guilt.

In the more enlightened sunlight of the present, it is now fair to conclude that the Reality Winner her parents know is the real Reality Winner.

In contrast to almost every prior defendant alleged to have disclosed or retained national defense information, Ms. Winner—an individual who has no criminal history and who honorably served her country, and who stands accused of "leaking" a single document, a single time, to a single source—was detained pending trial in this matter because the Court found no condition or combination of conditions would reasonably assure her appearance as required and the safety of any other person and the community. As demonstrated below, pre-trial detention in this case is not warranted.

The detention hearing should be reopened because there is new information material to the issue of pre-trial detention that supports Ms. Winner's release, consistent with applicable case law discussed in detail below. In addition, there are conditions that will reasonably assure Ms. Winner's appearance as required and the safety of any other person or the community. For example, the Court could require that Ms. Winner (1) reside in her home in Augusta under the custody of a third-party custodian; (2) not travel beyond Richmond County, Georgia without the

permission of her Pretrial Services Officer; (3) have regular contact with her Pretrial Services Officer; and/or (6) have her parents post their property as a bond. Given the availability of these conditions or some combination thereof and applicable precedent that demonstrates that courts have released nearly every other defendant charged with disclosing or retaining national defense information, Ms. Winner's continued detention is manifestly unjust, contrary to law, and not in accordance with the presumption of liberty.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Reality Winner's Background

Reality Leigh Winner has no experience with the criminal justice system. [Winner Decl. ¶ 3 (September 12, 2017)] Her first encounter with law enforcement was on June 3, 2017, when ten armed male law enforcement agents appeared at her home with search warrants for her house, her car, and her person. [*Id.*] At the conclusion of that encounter, Ms. Winner was arrested and transported to jail. She has been incarcerated since that time in the Lincoln County Jail. [*Id.*]

Ms. Winner has great respect for this country. Upon graduation from high school, she turned down a full engineering scholarship to Texas A&M to enlist in the United States Air Force. [*Id.* ¶ 4] She served in the Air Force for six years, and was honorably discharged in December 2016. [*Id.*; *see also* Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 11 (September 14, 2017)] She received a commendation medal for her work on an Afghan Mission and consistently received high evaluations. [Winner Decl. ¶ 4]

While in the Air Force, Ms. Winner's proficiency in languages garnered a placement at the Defense Language Institute in Monterey, California. [*Id.* ¶ 5] There she obtained an associate's degree in the Persian-Farsi and Dari courses. [*Id.*; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 11] Today,

she is fluent in Farsi, Dari, and Pashto. [*Id.*] While in the Air Force, she trained in Texas and spent time at Fort Meade, Maryland. [*Id.* ¶ 6] She also served for approximately six months at a Department of Defense facility in Augusta. [*Id.*]

Ms. Winner returned to Augusta upon her discharge from the Air Force to become a contractor for Pluribus International Corporation. [*Id.* ¶ 7] While living in Augusta, she had begun to develop a network of friends and colleagues with interests common to her own. [*Id.* ¶ 10] She even had a date planned at the time of her arrest. [*Id.*] She also had become part of the community through her teaching of yoga and spin classes and her volunteer work at the local animal shelter. [*Id.*; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 9] This was typical behavior for Ms. Winner, who had previously been an active participant in her community in Maryland, where she volunteered for Athletes Serving Athletes, an organization that assists disabled people who run marathons and participate in other sporting events. [Winner Decl. ¶ 6; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 9]

Ms. Winner is very connected with her family, especially her mother and step-father who reside in Texas and who travelled to Augusta to testify at her initial detention hearing. [Winner Decl. ¶ 11; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 7] She was close to her father who passed away in December 2016. [Winner Decl. ¶ 11] She is also close to her sister who resides in Michigan, her godson and other family members who reside in Wisconsin. [*Id.*; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 8]

Ms. Winner is vegan and Kosher and is in good physical condition. [*See id.* ¶ 12] She has suffered health problems since her detention because of the changed diet. She is now taking medication to aid her digestion of prison food and taking antibiotics because of issues with her skin. [*See id.* ¶ 13]

Ms. Winner has always had plans to continue her education, and is currently halfway through a bachelor's degree program. [*Id.* ¶ 14; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 11] If released, she

intends to continue her education. [Winner Decl. ¶ 14.] She also intends to continue teaching yoga and spin classes in order to earn income. [*Id.*]

B. Procedural Background

On June 3, 2017, this Court issued a Search and Seizure Warrant for Ms. Winner's home, vehicle, and person. [Doc. 2] She was arrested that day and made her initial appearance before this Court on June 5, 2017. [Doc. 9] She was remanded to the custody of the U.S. Marshal, and the Court set an arraignment and detention hearing for June 8, 2017. [Doc. 9] The day before the detention hearing, the Government filed an indictment charging Ms. Winner with a violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e). [Doc. 13]

The Court conducted a detention hearing on June 8, 2017, and denied pretrial release. [Doc. 26]

The Court also declared this case to be complex pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h) because of the procedures mandated by the Classified Information Procedures Act ("CIPA"). [Doc. 28] In doing so, the Court held that "it is difficult to predict how much time will be needed to prepare for trial." [*Id.*] Following a status conference on August 30, 2017, the Court entered an amended scheduling order continuing the trial date from October 23, 2017, to March 19, 2018, and establishing deadlines. [Doc. 66] On September 7, 2017, the Government filed a superseding indictment. [Doc. 72]

III. ARGUMENT

"In our society liberty is the norm, and detention prior to trial or without trial is the carefully limited exception." *United States v. Salerno*, 481 U.S. 739, 755 (1987) (The Bail Reform Act "authorizes the detention prior to trial of arrestees charged with serious felonies who are found after an adversary hearing to pose a threat to the safety of individuals or to the

community which no condition of release can dispel”). Due process concerns grow more serious as detention grows in length. *See United States v. Archambault*, 240 F. Supp. 2d 1082, 1085 (D.S.D. 2002) (“Courts have held that prolonged pre-trial detention may become excessive and consequently punitive so as to offend due process constraints.”) (citations omitted). New information justifies reopening Winner’s detention hearing and supports a conclusion that a combination of conditions will reasonably assure Ms. Winner’s appearance as required and the safety of the community.

A. There is New Information that Justifies Reopening the Detention Hearing.

The Bail Reform Act contemplates reopening a detention hearing “at any time before trial” if the defendant demonstrates that “information exists that was not known to the [defendant] at the time of the hearing and that has a material bearing” on detention. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f). Courts within the Eleventh Circuit have utilized the test applicable to motions for reconsideration in the civil context to guide them in making the determination to reopen a detention hearing. A detention hearing should be reopened when there is: “(1) an intervening change in the controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence; [or] (3) the need to correct clear error or prevent manifest injustice.” *United States v. Carrera*, No. 14-20286-CR, 2014 WL 3908204, at *2 (S.D. Fla. Aug. 11, 2014) (internal citations and marks omitted). Here, there is new evidence that was not available at the time of the initial detention hearing and a need to correct manifest injustice.

The following was not available at the time of the initial detention hearing and has a material bearing on the issue of release:

- The Government, by proffer, made assertions that Ms. Winner had admitted to disclosure of multiple “documents”—a fact that the Court specifically noted in its findings to support detention. The Government has since via email to this Court, retracted those assertions. The Government now alleges there was only one

document, rather than multiple documents, at issue. [See Exhibit A (email correspondence from Assistant United States Attorney Jennifer Solari to defense counsel and the Court dated June 29, 2017); Doc. 29 p. 105 (opining that the defendant could have additional material in her possession that could place the country in grave danger); *see also* Doc. 72]

- The Government, likewise, proffered that Ms. Winner asked her mother to transfer \$30,000 out of her account “because the Court took away her free appointed counsel.” [Doc. 29 pp. 27, 92] Yet, in the same email to the Court (which was sent after the initial detention hearing), the Government now clarified that Ms. Winner did not explicitly make that assertion. [See Exhibit A] Discovery produced by the Government indicates that Ms. Winner asked her mother to transfer the money out of her account because she feared the Government would freeze it. She wanted to make sure she could pay her bills. It was not because she wanted free counsel.
- Discovery produced by the Government and other information obtained by the defendant expressly contradicts or weakens the Government’s proffer of the evidence made during the initial detention hearing, which is material to the weight of the evidence against Ms. Winner, especially considering that the Government proclaimed at the initial detention hearing that it may uncover additional allegations of wrongdoing. [See Doc. 29 p. 89 (“We are not ruling out a superseding indictment adding more charges as we continue through our review of the information we’ve collected”)], and Ms. Winner’s history and characteristics [See *id.* at 106 (finding that, “[i]f we were dealing with the person that Miss Winner’s parents know and love, then there would be no question that she ought to be released”)] For example:
 - The Government proffered that Ms. Winner “inserted a removable thumb drive into a top secret computer” before she left the Air Force, and although the Government admitted it did not “know yet what she did with that thumb drive while it was inserted[,]” it later asserted that it “[d]idn’t] know how much information she might have taken in physical form when she inserted that USB device into a top secret computer when she was still on active duty with the Air Force,” ominously stating that “[w]e are [] concerned the defendant may have taken additional documents from her most recent employer and from the physical facility . . .” and “[w]e don’t know how much more she knows and how much more she knows and how much more she remembers, but we know she is extremely intelligent, so we would have to imagine she’s got quite a bit of very valuable information in her head.” [Id. at 97–98] Significantly, the Court expressly relied upon this proffer, specifically noting that “we don’t know what happened with [the thumb drive,]” and finding that, “[i]f that information [from the thumb drive] was downloaded from a top secret computer, by its very nature, that information would be -- put our country in grave danger.” [Id. at 107–08] Presumably, in the two months since its initial claim, the Government has conducted forensic analysis of the relevant computer

and/or thumb drive to determine whether classified information was in fact downloaded from that computer. And despite the Government's heavy reliance on the thumb drive Ms. Winner allegedly inserted into a top-secret computer, and despite the speculation that Ms. Winner has more classified information in her possession, there have been no further charges against her. Moreover, as discussed above, the Government felt compelled to correct and clarify its misstatements about the amount of information the defendant allegedly "leaked." [See Exhibit A] Unsupported conjecture is not evidence, much less clear and convincing evidence.

- The Government proffered information about Ms. Winner's use of a Tor browser to "access[] the notorious Dark Web." [*Id.* at 25] The Government failed to explain, however, that Ms. Winner told the Government during her interrogation on June 3, 2017, that she had used Tor once to look at WikiLeaks. Nor did the Government explain that millions of people use Tor not for any nefarious reason but to protect their personal privacy online. See Adam Clark Estes, *How to Hide Your Browsing History From Your Snooping ISP*, Gizmodo (Mar. 29, 2017), <http://gizmodo.com/how-to-hide-your-browsing-history-from-your-snooping-is-1793687193> (describing Tor as the "best bet" to protect one's privacy online). Indeed, Facebook promotes the fact that over a million people use Tor simply to access Facebook. Alec Muffett, *1 Million People use Facebook over Tor* (Apr. 22, 2016) <https://www.facebook.com/notes/facebook-over-tor/1-million-people-use-facebook-over-tor/865624066877648/>. The use of a browser used by millions of Americans and recommended by respectable entities should not be deemed a fact that supports denial of pretrial release. Who among us does not desire privacy in this world of Equifax leaks and the mass marketing of our computer searches?
- The Government proffered that Ms. Winner "acknowledged the information in the report could be used to injure the United States or to assist a foreign nation" [*Id.* at 20] Yet, that proffer did not explain the remainder of Ms. Winner's statements on June 3, 2017. As set forth in her Declaration submitted in connection with the Defendant's Motion to Suppress, Ms. Winner told law enforcement, "whatever we were using had already been compromised, and that this report was just going to be like a one drop in the bucket." [See Docs. 63, 64]
- Given her recent early retirement, Ms. Winner's mother has made arrangements to move to Augusta, Georgia, the week of September 25, 2017, and to serve as a third-party custodian for Ms. Winner for as long as necessary. [Winner-Davis Decl. ¶¶ 3–5] To that end, Ms. Winner's mother has added her name to the lease on Ms. Winner's apartment and is paying rent on the apartment. [*Id.*] Ms. Winner's mother's move to Augusta and willingness to assume responsibility for her daughter's compliance with

any conditions imposed by the Court are highly material to whether Ms. Winner would flee or pose a danger to the community. *See United States v. Miller*, No. 16-40026-TSH, 2017 WL 841277, at *2 (D. Mass. Mar. 2, 2017) (finding that new information related to living arrangements “arguably ‘bears’ on the question whether conditions exist that will reasonably assure Defendant’s appearance as required”); *United States v. Rosenschein*, No. 16-cr-4571 MCA, 2017 WL 3600739, at *5–6 (D.N.M. Jan. 6, 2017) (reopening detention hearing because the defendant’s sister came forward as willing to act as a third-party custodian).¹

- Ms. Winner has plans to obtain employment and stay occupied if the Court were to grant pretrial release including, among other things, teaching yoga and spin classes, and volunteering at the local animal shelter. This is material to whether Ms. Winner would flee, as it provides a meaningful connection to the community. [Winner Decl. ¶ 14; Winner-Davis Decl. ¶¶ 9–10] *See United States v. Wright*, No. 93–10093–01, 1993 WL 560902 (D. Kan. Dec. 2, 1993) (reopening detention hearing on offer of employment and qualification for home detention program).
- Since entering custody, Ms. Winner has had gastrointestinal issues as a result of a change to her diet, which is vegan and Kosher. This is material to her history and characteristics.
- Finally, there is a motion to suppress pending before the Court, which, if granted, will be material to the weight of the evidence against Ms. Winner. [See Doc. 29 p. 105 (explaining that the weight of the evidence was strong given a “confession” by the defendant)] *See United States v. Espinoza*, No. CR S-08-0447 JAM, 2009 WL 3614849, at *1 (E.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2009) (finding the granting of motion to suppress and the Pretrial Services Officer’s completion of interview of the defendant and family members sufficient to reopen detention hearing); *United States v. Shareef*, 907 F. Supp. 1471, 1483 (D. Kan. 1995) (reopening a detention hearing after suppression of evidence).

This new information is material to whether Ms. Winner is a flight risk or a danger to others or the community if released, either individually or on a collective basis. The Court should reopen the detention hearing and reconsider whether any condition or combination of conditions could be imposed to adequately assure the safety of the community and the

¹ *See also United States v. Milano*, No. CR 13-00366-JSW (KAW), 2013 WL 3942035, at *4 (N.D. Cal. July 26, 2013) (suggesting that information relating to a “suitable place to live, and a suitable surety” would allow the court to reopen the detention hearing); *United States v. Collazos*, No. 2013-10017-JLT-11, 2013 WL 12212728, at *3 n.3 (D. Mass. Apr. 16, 2013) (explaining that the court stood “willing to reopen the detention hearing upon counsel’s request if and when counsel [had] evidence to introduce or proffer”); *United States v. Wagoner*, No. 3:12-cr-85, 2012 WL 5422232, at *2 (E.D. Tenn. Nov. 5, 2012) (finding that a change in living conditions, along with the resolution of the defendant’s competency, sufficient to reopen detention hearing); *United States v. Ward*, 63 F. Supp. 2d 1203, 1207 (C.D. Cal. 1999) (reopening detention hearing based on willingness of defendant’s family to post security for bond).

appearance of Ms. Winner as required. *See United States v. Pimentel*, No. 11-40041-FDS, 2012 WL 1581160, at *2 (D. Mass. Apr. 27, 2012) (giving “the Defendant the benefit of the doubt and find[ing] that . . . information was not known to him at the time of the original hearings” and reopening the detention hearing under § 3142(f)).

The Court may reopen the detention hearing to prevent manifest injustice. The Defense submits that there are conditions relevant to the § 3142 inquiry that were not identified by the Court in the original detention hearing that support Ms. Winner’s pretrial release. In particular, while the Court commended Ms. Winner’s parents for agreeing to post their house as their bond,² the Court surmised that the person her parents know is “at odds” with the person the Government described. [Doc. 29 pp. 107–08] The Court did not explain why the condition proposed coupled or combined with additional conditions (in accord with those imposed in other Espionage Act cases), and placing Ms. Winner in the custody of a third party (i.e., conditions that directly relate to the safety and flight concerns raised by the Government and the Court during the detention hearing), would not reasonably assure the Defendant’s appearance as required and the safety of the community. Moreover, in the initial detention hearing, the Government did not present any reliable evidence demonstrating Ms. Winner is a flight risk, and detaining Ms. Winner on that basis given the new evidence before the Court is manifestly unjust.³ *See United States v. Gerkin*, 570 F. App’x 819, 822 (10th Cir. 2014) (explaining that the Bail Reform Act “requires that the court consider a range of alternatives to pre-trial confinement before ordering detention and, if detention is ordered, to explain why lesser conditions are inadequate”); *United States v. Xulam*,

² Ms. Winner’s mother and stepfather are willing to post their property in Kleberg County, Texas, as bond, which consists of twenty acres and a modest home, and it has a taxable value of approximately \$135,000 [Winner-Davis Decl. ¶ 6; *see also* Doc. 29 pp. 53–54 (“We have 20 acres of land that’s paid for in Kleberg County along with a house that sits upon it. We have -- you know, whatever it’s worth. And I don’t really know what that’s worth, but it’s a couple hundred thousand dollars.”)].

³ The few facts proffered by the Government were insufficient to demonstrate by a preponderance of the evidence that Ms. Winner is a flight risk. *See infra*, Part III.B.

84 F.3d 441, 443 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (revoking order of detention where neither “the magistrate judge [nor] the district judge fully explored the commitments offered by the [defendant’s] witnesses or the [defendant’s] proffer that he was willing to abide by whatever conditions the court imposed”); *United States v. Berrios-Berrios*, 791 F.2d 246, 251 (2d Cir. 1986) (remanding to the district court because the district court failed to “explain on the record the extent to which it considered any alternatives to incarceration and, if so, on what basis they were rejected”).

B. Courts Routinely Grant Bail To Defendants Charged with Similar Offenses.

While the foregoing argument demonstrates there are conditions that will ensure her appearance as required and the safety of others and the community, significantly, the vast majority of other courts have decided that defendants charged with offenses similar to the charge against Ms. Winner were entitled to be released pending trial, as set forth in the chart below.⁴

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
<i>Bryan Nishimura</i> Case No. 1:15-cr-145-KJN (E.D. Cal.)	Accused of downloading and storing classified military records on personal electronic devices, carrying classified materials when he traveled off base in Afghanistan, and bringing documents back to the U.S. at the end of his deployment. Charged with unauthorized removal and retention of classified documents and materials, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1924.	Released

⁴ One defendant, Donald Sachtleben, is omitted from this chart. See *United States v. Sachtleben*, Case No. 1:13-cr-200 (S.D. Ind.). Mr. Sachtleben was accused of disclosing information related to a foiled bomb attack in Yemen and retaining national defense information at his residence. He was charged with unauthorized disclosure of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d), and unauthorized possession and retention of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), and he was detained at his initial appearance without objection. Winner submits that she is differently situated from Mr. Sachtleben because Mr. Sachtleben was also alleged to have distributed and possessed child pornography in a separate case. See *United States v. Sachtleben*, Case No. 1:12-cr-127 (S.D. Ind.). It is presumed under the Bail Reform Act “that no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person and the safety of the community if the judicial officer finds that there is probable cause to believe that the person committed” such crimes. See 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e).

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
David Howell Patreaus Case No. 3:15-cv-47-DCK (W.D.N.C.)	Accused of sharing classified information regarding war strategy, intelligence capabilities, and identities of covert officers to his biographer/mistress. Charged with unauthorized removal and retention of classified information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1924.	Released
John Kiriakou Case No. 1:12-cr-127 (E.D. Va.)	Former CIA officer who was accused of leaking identity of colleagues involved in “enhanced” interrogation programs, specifically waterboarding, to a reporter. Charged with disclosure of classified information identifying a covert agent, in violation of 50 U.S.C. § 421(a), 3 counts of transmission of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d), and false statements, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(1).	Released without objection by Government on personal recognizance and \$250,000 unsecured bond, and conditions, including but not limited to: • wife and brother had to sign bond within 5 days • could not leave D.C. metro area without approval • not allowed to move without approval • avoid contact with witnesses • report to pretrial services • surrender passport and not obtain a new one

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
James Hitselberger Case No. 1:12-cr-231 (D.D.C.) ⁵	Accused of leaking classified materials concerning Bahrain to Hoover Institute. Charged with 2 counts of unlawful retention of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), and concealment, removal, or mutilation of a public record, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 2071(a).	Initially detained for four and one half months, but then released into the High Intensity Supervision Program, which included conditions, including but not limited to: • GPS location monitoring • could not enter Union Station or any other bus or train station, or airport, that would allow access outside of the D.C. metropolitan area • could not travel beyond 25 miles from Washington, D.C. • had to meet with pretrial services once a week and call the pretrial services officer once a day • had to surrender passport and agree not to obtain a new one The court later modified the conditions of release without objection from the Government.

⁵ The magistrate judge detained Mr. Hitselberger, finding he presented both a danger to the community and a risk of flight, which could not be mitigated by any conditions of release. On appeal to the district judge, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3145(b), Mr. Hitselberger asserted he was not a danger to the community if released because he no longer had access to classified information, and the government did not contest the argument. The issue, therefore, was whether there were any conditions that would reasonably assure Mr. Hitselberger's appearance as required. The district judge was ultimately "satisfied" that the conditions imposed upon him would "reasonably" assure his appearance. See *United States v. Hitselberger*, 909 F. Supp. 2d 4 (D.D.C. 2012). It is also notable that Mr. Hitselberger had access to classified information produced by the government in his case. See *United States v. Hitselberger*, Case No. 1:12-cr-231 (D.D.C.) Docket Entry No. 31 (Feb. 13, 2013).

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
Jeffrey Sterling Case No. 1:10-cr-485 (E.D. Va.)	Former CIA officer accused of leaking classified information about efforts to sabotage Iranian nuclear research to New York Times reporter. Charged with 3 counts of unauthorized disclosure of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d), 3 counts of unauthorized disclosure of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), unlawful retention of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), mail fraud, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1341, unauthorized conveyance of government property, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 641, and obstruction of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1512(c)(1).	Released on personal recognizance and unsecured bond of \$10,000 by third-party custodian and conditions, including but not limited to: • placed in custody of third-party custodian • had to actively seek employment • could not leave D.C. metro area without approval • avoid all contact and communication with alleged victims or potential witnesses unless in presence of defense counsel • report to pretrial services • refrain from possessing firearm • refrain from excessive use of alcohol • undergo psychiatric treatment and take medications • surrender passport and do not obtain a new one • notify any employer of indictment and charges involved
Thomas Drake Case No. 1:10-cr-181 (D. Md.)	Senior executive of the NSA accused of leaking information regarding NSA waste and mismanagement to reporter. Charged with 5 counts of willful retention of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), obstruction of justice, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1519, and 4 counts of making a false statement, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a).	Released on conditions, including but not limited to: • surrender any passport to Clerk's Office • obtain no passport • restrict travel to Maryland, D.C., and Virginia • travel had to be approved by pretrial services

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
Stephen Jin-Woo Kim Case No. 1:10-cr-225 (D.D.C.)	Former senior adviser for intelligence on detail to the State Department's arms control compliance bureau accused of sharing classified information from an intelligence report on North Korea with Fox News reporter. Charged with unauthorized disclosure of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d), and false statements, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001(a)(2).	Released on conditions, including but not limited to: • bond in the amount of \$100,000 secured by real property • report weekly by phone to pretrial services • no travel more than 25 miles outside of D.C. metro area except to California for work or to visit son with notice given to pretrial services and Government
Shamai Leibowitz Case No. 8:09-cr-632 (D. Md.)	Linguist for the FBI accused of leaking classified information to a blogger. Charged with disclosure of classified information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 798(a).	Released after initial appearance and arraignment with conditions, including but not limited to: • required to report to pretrial services on regular basis • surrender passports and obtain no new passport • restricted travel to D.C.; • required to obtain approval for other travel • not allowed to move
Kenneth W. Ford, Jr. Case No. 8:05-CR-98-PJM / Case No. 8:05-cr-235-PJM (D. Md.)	Accused of keeping classified information from NSA, where he worked, in his home. Charged with aiding and abetting unauthorized possession of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), and making a material false statement to a government agency, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1001.	Released
Samuel Berger Case No. 1:05-MJ-175-DAR (D.D.C.)	Accused of removing classified documents from National Archives and storing them at his office, and destroying some documents. Charged with unauthorized removal and retention of classified material, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 1924.	Released

DEFENDANT	NATURE OF CASE AND CHARGES	STATUS PENDING TRIAL
Lawrence Franklin Case Nos. 1:05-CR-225, 1:05-CR-421 (E.D. Va.) and 3:05-CR-48 (N.D. W.Va.)	Former Department of Defense employee accused of disclosing classified military information regarding U.S. policy toward Iran to pro-Israel lobbyists and an Israeli diplomat. Charged with conspiracy to communicate national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(g), 3 counts of communication of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d), and conspiracy to communicate classified information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371, in Case No. 1:05-CR-225. Charged with unlawful retention of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(e), in Case No. 1:05-CR-421.	Released on \$100,000 unsecured bond
Steven J. Rosen Case No. 1:05-CR-225 (E.D. Va.)	Accused of disclosing classified national security information to journalists and unnamed foreign power. Charged with conspiracy to communicate national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(g), and communication of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d).	Released on personal recognizance and \$100,000 unsecured bond
Keith Weissman Case No. 1:05-CR-225 (E.D. Va.)	Accused of disclosing classified national security information to journalists and unnamed foreign power. Charged with conspiracy to communicate national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(g), and communication of national defense information, in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 793(d).	Released on personal recognizance and \$100,000 unsecured bond

Thus, the norm for cases involving disclosure or retention of national defense information, given that there is no “presumption” for detention under § 3142, is pre-trial release or release with conditions. Moreover, unlike the above defendants, Ms. Winner is accused of leaking a single document a single time to a single source. This point was made by this Court at the August 30, 2017, status conference, noting that other Espionage Act cases were much different than this one, given the repeated disclosures over extended periods of time present in other cases, a point supporting Ms. Winner’s release. [See Doc. 84 pp. 10–11] The Defense submits that, to the extent the Court has any doubt whether there are conditions that the Court can impose upon her that will reasonably assure her appearance as required and the safety of others and the community, these prior cases resolve that doubt. Detention should not be presumed. That which is not the “norm,” is likewise not appropriate here.

C. There is No Confession and the Guilt of Ms. Winner is Far from Certain.

At the June 8, 2017 pretrial release hearing, the Government asserted by proffer:

Following her confession and after a decision was made to arrest the defendant, agents allowed the defendant to call somebody to care for her pets.

Doc. 29, 21:24 – 22:1.

In denying pretrial release, this Court found:

You do have a confession by this defendant when she met with the agents, as detailed in the affidavit by one of the investigative agents.

Doc. 29, 105:15-17.

What Ms. Winner allegedly told the agents may be fairly labeled as an admission, though one obtained without appropriate Miranda warnings, but it was not a confession. A *confession* is “a complete and conscious admission of guilt.” *Oppen v. U.S.*, 348 U.S. 84, 91 (1954).

Ms. Winner is not charged with an unauthorized release of a document stamped classified, secret or top secret. She is charged with a violation of the Espionage Act of 1917 as amended. 18 U.S.C. § 793(e)⁶. Indeed, the word *classified* is nowhere to be found in that statute.

Espionage is conduct traditionally viewed as stealing military secrets and providing those secrets to an enemy of the United States.⁷ The Espionage Act was enacted long before there existed the system of classification of government documents under which the Government now designates matters as *classified*, *secret* and *top secret*. Our Government's classification system is established by executive order and not by a statute enacted by Congress. The present language of § 793(e) was enacted in 1950 as an amendment to the Espionage Act.

An oft-cited and lengthy study of the history of the Espionage Act of 1917 is to be found in a 1973 Columbia Law Review article. H. Edgar and B.C. Schmidt, Jr., *The Espionage Statutes and Publication of Defense Information*, 73 Colum. L. Rev. 929. The authors noted:

A number of legislative proposals have been introduced since 1950 that can only reflect the assumption that the espionage statutes do not prohibit non-culpable disclosure of properly classified information.

Perhaps the most significant of these proposals, that of the Government Security Commission, would have made unauthorized disclosure of classified

⁶ Section 793(e) provides:

(e) Whoever having unauthorized possession of, access to, or control over any document, writing, code book, signal book, sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, instrument, appliance, or note relating to the national defense, or information relating to the national defense which information the possessor has reason to believe could be used to the injury of the United States or to the advantage of any foreign nation, willfully communicates, delivers, transmits or causes to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted, or attempts to communicate, deliver, transmit or cause to be communicated, delivered, or transmitted the same to any person not entitled to receive it, or willfully retains the same and fails to deliver it to the officer or employee of the United States entitled to receive it;

⁷ Black's Law Dictionary defines *espionage* as, "The activity of using spies to collect information about what another government or company is doing or plans to do."

information a crime. The measure made no progress at all in Congress, and was abandoned by the Executive as politically untenable.

Id. at 1056 (emphasis added).

The authors further note:

The Executive has nowhere asserted that communication of classified information to a person not authorized by Executive regulations to receive it is a crime. Congress has always refused to enact such proposals to put criminal sanctions of general scope behind the classification system.

Id. at 1057 (emphasis added).

Congress did subsequently pass a statute in 2000 that would have expressly criminalized the disclosure of classified information. H.R. Doc. No. 106-309, at 3-4 (2000). However, the bill was vetoed. *See* M.R. Papandrea, *Lapdogs, Watchdogs and Scapegoats: The Press and National Security Information*, 83 Ind. L. J. 233, 262-264 (2008).

Prosecution under the Espionage Act of those who are labeled as “whistle blowers” and “leakers” is of recent origin, with most prosecutions having been brought in the last decade. Moreover, the statutory term *national defense* refers to military action:

National defense, the Government maintains, ‘is a generic concept of broad connotations, referring to the military and naval establishments and the related activities of national preparedness.’ We agree that the words ‘national defense’ in the Espionage Act carry that meaning.

The reports [at issue], in short, are a part of this nation's plan for armed defense.

Gorin v. U.S., 312 U.S. 19, 28-29 (1941).

Russian attempts to interfere with our elections are despicable, but whether information about these Russian efforts falls within the scope of information about the secret activities of our army and navy that the Espionage Act was enacted to protect is doubtful.

Dissemination of information found in “reports relating to the national defense, published by authority of Congress or the military” is not forbidden by the Espionage Act. *Gorin*, 312 U.S. at 28. Disclosure of information already in the public domain does not violate the Espionage Act. *United States v. Heine*, 151 F.2d 813 (2d Cir. 1945) (L. Hand, J.) wherein the conviction of a German spy under the Espionage Act was reversed, with the Court noting:

All of this information came from sources that were lawfully accessible to anyone who was willing to take the pains to find, sift and collate it;

Id. at 815.

The Court then held:

It is not necessary for us to go so far; and in any event ‘secrets’ is an equivocal word whose definition might prove treacherous. It is enough in the case at bar to hold, as we do, that whatever it was lawful to broadcast throughout the country it was lawful to prepare and publish domestically all that Heine put in his reports.

Id. at 816.

Statements allegedly made by Ms. Winner thus are not a “confession.” Her guilt as to the charge found in the indictment is doubtful.

D. The Court Should Release Winner with Conditions.

Courts should detain defendants “[o]nly in rare circumstances,” and “only for the strongest of reasons.” *United States v. Motamedi*, 767 F.2d 1403, 107 (9th Cir. 1985) (citations omitted). “Doubts regarding the propriety of release should be resolved in favor of the defendant.” *Id.*; see also *United States v. Kaplowitz*, No. 14-203230CR, 2014 WL 2155231, at *4 (S.D. Fla. May 22, 2014) (citing *Motamedi*).

A defendant is properly detained pending trial when a court makes one of two findings: (1) that the Government has shown by clear and convincing evidence that “no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure . . . the safety of any other person and the

community,” or (2) that the Government has shown by a preponderance of the evidence that “no condition or combination of conditions will reasonably assure the appearance of the person as required.” 18 U.S.C. § 3142(e). Significantly, there is no “presumption” arising from the nature of the charges in this case that Winner should be detained. *Id.* The Bail Reform Act sets out a number of conditions that may be imposed to ensure a defendant’s appearance in court and the safety of the community, including, among other things, that the defendant remain in the custody of a designated person who agrees to supervise the defendant and report violations of release conditions to the court; maintain employment; maintain an educational program; abide by restrictions on travel; report on a regular basis to pretrial services; refrain from alcohol use; and execute a bail bond. *See* 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c)(1)–(xiv).

The Eighth Amendment to our Constitution provides:

Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Pretrial releases is the norm, and denial of this constitutionally guaranteed right is a rare exception in non-capital cases. People charged with thievery, burglary, drug dealing and all sorts of violent crimes are routinely granted bail and released pending trial.

It is the *Government’s burden* to demonstrate that none of these conditions of release nor any combination of these or other conditions of release will reasonably assure Ms. Winner’s appearance as required and the safety of the community. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(c), (f); *United States v. Medina*, 775 F.2d 1398, 1402 (11th Cir. 1985). A court should take into account: (1) the nature and circumstances of the offense charged; (2) the weight of the evidence against the defendant; (3) the history and characteristics of the defendant, including among other things, the defendant’s character, physical and mental condition, family ties, employment, financial resources, community ties, past conduct, drug and alcohol abuse, and criminal history; and (4)

the nature and seriousness of the danger to any person or the community that would be posed by release. 18 U.S.C. § 3142(g)(1)–(4).

With respect to release, the Government has no evidence to suggest that Ms. Winner will not appear for all proceedings in this action if released. Ms. Winner has no criminal history, or any other history to suggest that she would not appear as required. *See United States v. Ceballo*, No. 12-80211-CR-Hurley/Hopkins, 2012 WL 7050591, at * 4 (S.D. Fla. Dec. 14, 2012) (explaining that the defendant’s “lack of criminal history weighs heavily in favor of his pretrial release”) At the hearing, the Government made much of the fact that Ms. Winner took a recent trip to Belize—a sight-seeking trip over the Memorial Day weekend 2017 (which was after the date the Government alleges Ms. Winner unlawfully transmitted the intelligence reporting to an online news outlet), from which she returned. [Winner Decl. ¶ 8] Such a singular vacation does not—and this Court did not hold that it does—make her a flight risk. The Government also suggested that a search for information about Tel Aviv indicates Ms. Winner has a propensity to flee; yet, Ms. Winner merely “clicked” on a link to check about cheap airfare—she never planned a trip there, nor is there any evidence to suggest such a claim. [*Id.* ¶ 9]⁸ When did an interest in travel to the Holy Land become clear and convincing evidence in support of denial of one’s constitutional right to bail prior to trial? The Government also noted Ms. Winner’s journal entries. While those journal entries may show a desire to travel to various locations around the world, they do not suggest that Ms. Winner will present any sort of flight risk if released on conditions pending trial in this case, specifically a geographic restriction. Indeed, “[s]ection 3142 speaks of conditions that will ‘reasonably’ assure appearance, not guarantee it.” *Xulam*, 84

⁸ The United States has an extradition treaty with Israel. *See Protocol Amending the Convention between the United States of America and Israel of December 10, 1962*, July 6, 2005, available at <https://www.state.gov/documents/organization/171403.pdf>. It therefore defies reason to believe that Ms. Winner was seeking to “flee” the United States, even if she had planned a trip there.

F.3d at 444 (explaining that the legislative history of the Bail Reform Act acknowledges the feasibility of conditions even “where there is a substantial risk of flight”).

Regarding dangerousness, the Government suggested at the initial detention hearing that Ms. Winner possesses classified information and will disclose that information if released. Yet, despite making numerous assertions at the last detention hearing—some of which the Government then had to retract as being untrue⁹—the Government has not come forward with any assertion or proof that Ms. Winner disclosed any national defense information other than the intelligence reporting cited in the superseding indictment. The Government has not, for example, charged Ms. Winner with any offenses related to the thumb drive that she allegedly inserted into a computer while still in the Air Force, even though this was central to the Government’s argument for detention at the initial hearing and the Government has now had months to analyze the relevant computer and/or thumb drive to determine whether Ms. Winner actually downloaded classified information (which she did not). Indeed, the superseding indictment repeats the same alleged singular disclosure as the original indictment against Ms. Winner. In other words, the Government has not pointed to any other document she has allegedly “leaked,” and her access to classified information is limited to discovery in this case, which this Court has restricted. [See Doc. 60] Regardless, there are conditions that would protect the safety of others and the community to ensure compliance with any conditions of her release.

To that end, Ms. Winner is amenable to any condition the Court places on her and is willing to appear at every proceeding, and she specifically proposes the following conditions, in addition to those typical conditions placed on the majority of defendants who appear before this Court.

⁹ See Exhibit A (email correspondence from Assistant United States Attorney Jennifer Solari to defense counsel and the Court dated June 29, 2017).

IV. CONCLUSION

As set forth above, there is new information material to the issue of pre-trial detention that supports Ms. Winner's release. Moreover, as with her predecessors, there are conditions that will reasonably assure Ms. Winner's appearance as required and the safety of any other person and the community. For example, the Court may impose any combination of the following conditions: (1) reside in her home in Augusta under the custody of a third-party custodian; (2) not travel beyond Richmond County, Georgia without the permission of her Pretrial Services Officer; (3) have regular contact with her Pretrial Services Officer; or (4) have her parents post their property as bond. These conditions will serve the purposes of 18 U.S.C. § 3142, and Ms. Winner is amenable to any condition imposed upon her by the Court.

WHEREFORE, pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3142(f), Ms. Winner respectfully requests that the Court (1) reopen the detention hearing, (2) find that there is a combination of conditions that will reasonably assure her appearance as required and the safety of any other person and the community, and (3) release Ms. Winner pending trial, and that the Court grant such additional relief as may be warranted. In addition, the Defendant requests a hearing at the earliest practicable time to address the motion.

Respectfully submitted,

BY: /s/John C. Bell, Jr.
John C. Bell, Jr. (Bar No. 048600)
Titus T. Nichols (Bar No. 870662)
BELL & BRINGHAM
PO Box 1547
Augusta, GA 30903-1547
(706) 722-2014
John@bellbrigham.com
Titus@bellbrigham.com

Joe D. Whitley (Bar No. 756150)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
Brett A. Switzer (Bar No. 554141)
**BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.**
3414 Peachtree Rd., NE Suite 1600
Atlanta, GA 30326
(404) 577-6000
JWhitley@bakerdonelson.com
BSwitzer@bakerdonelson.com

Matthew S. Chester (La. Bar No. 36411)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
**BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.**
201 St. Charles Ave., Suite 3600
New Orleans, LA 70170
(504) 566-5200
MChester@bakerdonelson.com

Jill E. McCook (Tn. Bar No. 033813)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
**BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.**
265 Brookview Centre Way, Suite 600
Knoxville, TN 37919
(865) 549-7129
JMCook@bakerdonelson.com

Thomas H. Barnard (Az. Bar No. 27488)
Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*
**BAKER, DONELSON, BEARMAN,
CALDWELL & BERKOWITZ, P.C.**
100 Light Street.
Baltimore, MD 21202
(410) 685-1120
TBarnard@bakerdonelson.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
REALITY LEIGH WINNER**

Exhibit A

John Bell

From: Solari, Jennifer (USAGAS) <Jennifer.Solari@usdoj.gov>
Sent: Thursday, June 29, 2017 2:40 PM
To: Titus Nichols; John Bell; Lisa_Widener@gas.uscourts.gov
Cc: Edelstein, Julie (NSD) (JMD); Aaron, David (NSD) (JMD); Aaron, David C. (CYD) (OGA) (FBI)
Subject: Corrections and clarifications regarding information proffered at Detention Hearing from jail phone calls
Attachments: 10.61.0.21-72f2db020a3d00154a02bb5a456de8bawinner 2.wav

All,

I have now had an opportunity to listen to the phone calls the defendant made from the Lincoln County Jail prior to her detention hearing. Before the hearing, I had only heard a portion of the call in which the defendant asked her mother to “play that angle” regarding the alleged circumstances of her FBI interview. I proffered information about the other jail calls based upon verbal summaries I was provided by the FBI just before the hearing. Now that I’ve heard the recordings myself, I’d like to clarify some of the information for the court and counsel.

- (1) At the hearing, I said something to the effect of: “On the Sunday after her arrest, the defendant spoke to her mother on the recorded jail phone. Her mom asked her, ‘Do you know what you’re getting charged with?’ The defendant answered, ‘Mom, those documents. I screwed up.’ Said she was preparing herself like she wasn’t coming home. Perhaps what’s most disconcerting about her use of the word “documents” – plural – is that she has only admitted taking and sending the single intelligence report we knew about.”

The audio on this file is not easy to hear without high quality headphones, but upon my own review, I hear the following:

At 7:25

MOM: Do you have any idea what you’re gonna be charged with?

DEF: Yeah.

MOM: What is it?

DEF: Um. . . I leaked a document.

MOM: Oh.

DEF: [Inaudible]

MOM: What?

DEF: I don't know if they give bail for that.

Approximately 9 minutes later in the conversation (16:27), the defendant states, "I screwed up." I have attached the audio file.

(2) Also at the hearing, I stated something to the effect of: "She just asked her mother to transfer \$30,000 from her account to her mother's account because the Court took away her free, appointed counsel." It was my misunderstanding when I spoke to the agent that the reason for the transfer was explicit in the conversation, but I believe it is more of an inference to be gleaned from the request and the surrounding circumstances. (The defendant has asked her cellmate, "Angie" to call her mother.) When I review the call (coming in a following email due to size), I hear the following:

At 3:06

ANGIE: She said will you please log onto her bank -

MOM: Okay.

ANGIE: And transfer from her savings account -

MOM: Okay.

ANGIE: Into your account.

MOM: Into my account?

ANGIE: Yes ma'am.

MOM: Why?

ANGIE: Into your account -

MOM: Why? Why?

ANGIE: Under Momface.

MOM: Momface, okay, but why?

ANGIE: She says "why"?

WINNER: Uh, because they might freeze it.

ANGIE: They might freeze it – oh, they said they will freeze it.

WINNER: Yeah.

MOM: Oh, shit!

WINNER: Yeah, so as soon as this conversation's over...

ANGIE: Yeah, she says like right, like, right now, like, an hour ago.

WINNER: Yeah.

MOM: Okay. Okay. Wow, alright we'll do that. We'll do that immediately, so, good. Okay.

ANGIE: She said something else – what - twen - thirty grand.

MOM: Okay.

ANGIE: She said thirty. Okay.

MOM: Alright, okay, we'll do that.

Thank you,
Jenna

Jennifer G. Solari
Assistant U.S. Attorney
Southern District of Georgia
22 Barnard St., Suite 300
Savannah, GA 31401
(912) 652-4422

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 19, 2017, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the ECF system, which sent notification of such filing to counsel of record for all parties.

/s/John C. Bell, Jr.
JOHN C. BELL, JR.